



**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
<b><u>1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST</u></b> .....	2
<b><u>2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES</u></b> .....	3
<b><u>3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS</u></b> .....	4
<b><u>4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS</u></b> .....	5
<b><u>5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER</u></b> .....	6
<b><u>6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL</u></b> .....	13
<b><u>7. ARGUMENT</u></b> .....	14
<b><u>8. SUMMARY</u></b> .....	26
<b><u>CLAIMS APPENDIX</u></b> .....	28
<b><u>EVIDENCE APPENDIX</u></b> .....	48
<b><u>RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX</u></b> .....	49



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Ravindra K. Shetty et al.      Examiner: Peter H. Choi

Serial No.: 09/893,091

Group Art Unit: 3623

Filed: June 27, 2001

Docket: H0002099.33506

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR BUSINESS GOAL-OPTIMIZATION WHEN  
CUSTOMER DEMAND CANNOT BE SATISFIED

---

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief- Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Appeal Brief is presented in response to the Office Action dated November 30, 2006, and further in support of the Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, filed herewith. The claims 1-60 have been thrice rejected, and a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief has previously been filed. The response of the Patent Office to the previous Appeal Brief was to reopen prosecution, and it issued the outstanding Office Action of November 30, 2006. The Applicant respectfully reinstates the appeal with the current Notice of Appeal and Appeal brief.

The Applicant has paid the fees associated with the previous Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief, and believes that no further fees are due at this time. If the Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 for any required amount. The Appellant respectfully requests consideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejections of pending claims.

**1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest of the above-captioned patent application is the assignee,  
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.

## **2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant that will have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

**3. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

The present application was filed on June 27, 2001 with claims 1 through 60. A non-final Office Action was mailed on October 7, 2005. A Final Office Action (hereinafter "the Final Office Action") was mailed on March 3, 2006. The Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on July 3, 2006, and filed an Appeal Brief on September 5, 2006. The Patent Office responded to the Applicant's Appeal Brief by reopening prosecution, and issuing the current outstanding Office Action of November 30, 2006. The Applicant reinstates the appeal with the filing of the instant appeal brief. Claims 1 through 60 stand thrice rejected, remain pending, and are the subject of the present Appeal.

#### **4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments have been made subsequent to the Final Office Action dated March 3, 2006.

## **5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Some aspects of the present inventive subject matter include, but are not limited to, systems and methods of production and inventory management, and may be further directed to management of an individual customer order to maximize a profit. Accordingly, the various aspects may find application in an industry that practices production and/or delivery management.

With reference to FIG. 3, and the description starting at page 9 of the application, a method 300 includes determining 310 that one or more requests from the customer for a plurality of products (and/or services) exceeds a production capacity of a vendor. The request includes a quantity that is associated with each of the plurality of products identified in the customer order. The request is from the customer order data that originates with the customer. Method 300 also includes determining at block 320 a reduced quantity of each of the plurality of products that corresponds to a vendor maximum profit. The reduced quantity is determined from a degradation of the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products (and/or services), using an inverse probability of profitability. The block 320 is described in further detail in FIG. 6, and in the corresponding description beginning at page 12 and continuing at least to page 15. The method 300 may further include communicating at block 330 the reduced quantity to a production management process. This description generally corresponds to independent claim 1.

With reference now to FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and the description starting at page 9 of the application, and continuing at least to page 11, a method 400 includes the vendor obtaining at block 410 process and inventory operation data from the vendor. The process and inventory operation data includes an inventory quantity and an inventory identity for each item, and may also include a target time for a requested delivery. An effective quantity for each of the plurality of products is determined at block 430 that determines if a requested quantity exceeds an inventory quantity. An actual time to produce all of the requested plurality of products is determined at block 440, and is compared to the target time at block 450, so that if the actual time is greater than or equal to the target time, the customer order exceeds a production capacity of the vendor, and a graceful degradation of the production quantity is required, as shown in

block 460. Block 440 is described in further detail with reference to FIG. 5, and the corresponding description beginning at page 11 and continuing to at least page 12 of the present application. This description generally corresponds to independent claim 4.

Referring now to FIG. 3, FIG. 4, FIG. 5 and in particular to FIG. 6, and the description starting at page 9, and continuing at least to page 15 of the present application, a method 600 includes determining at block 610 a time shortfall, defined as a difference between the actual time and the target time. The time shortfall is communicated to the customer at block 620. At block 640, an inverse profit probability is calculated, that reflects the portion of the total profit that will be derived from the product. A graceful decrement is determined at block 650, which is determined from the time shortfall, based upon the time short fall, the calculated inverse profit probability, and the current number of products. An objective value is updated at block 660 (as shown in Table 6 on page 14) and the actual quantity is determined at block 670 (as shown in Table 7 on page 14). An actual production time is determined at block 680, which is the summation of the objective values over the number of products (as shown in Table 2 on page 15). The foregoing description generally corresponds to independent claim 13.

Claim 19 is directed to a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions to perform a method of production management. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124, having computer-executable instructions to perform the method. The foregoing memory devices are examples of computer readable media, as described at page 6, lines 12 through 13. The method recited in claim 19 is described, at least, in pages 9 through 15, and in FIG. 3 through FIG. 6 of the present application. For example, the method 300 of FIG. 3 includes determining at block 320 a reduced quantity of each of the plurality of products. The reduced quantity is determined from a degradation of the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products (and/or services), using an inverse probability of profitability. The block 320 is described in further detail in FIG. 6, and in the corresponding description beginning at page 12 and continuing at least to page 15. The method 300 may further include communicating at block 330 the reduced quantity to a production management process.

Claim 22 is also directed to a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions to perform a method of production management. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124 capable of storing the executable instructions. FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and the description starting at page 9 of the application, and continuing at least to page 11, describes a method 400 that includes the vendor obtaining, at block 410, process and inventory operation data from the vendor. The process and inventory operation data includes an inventory quantity and an inventory identity for each item, and may also include a target time for a requested delivery. An effective quantity for each of the plurality of products is determined at block 430 that determines if a requested quantity exceeds an inventory quantity. An actual time to produce all of the requested plurality of products is determined at block 440, and is compared to the target time at block 450, so that if the actual time is greater than or equal to the target time, the customer order exceeds a production capacity of the vendor, and a graceful degradation of the production quantity is required, as shown in block 460. Block 440 is described in further detail with reference to FIG. 5, and the corresponding description beginning at page 11 and continuing to at least page 12 of the present application.

Claim 31 is also directed to a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions to perform a method of production management. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124 capable of storing the executable instructions. With reference to FIG. 3, at block 310, the method 300 includes determining that at least one request exceeds a production capacity of a vendor. At block 320, a reduced quantity of each of the plurality of products is determined. With reference to FIG. 4, the method 400 further includes determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products that determines if a requested quantity exceeds an inventory quantity. An actual time to produce all of the requested plurality of products is determined at block 440, and is compared to the target time at block 450, so that if the actual time is greater than or equal to the target time, the customer order exceeds a production capacity of the vendor, and a graceful degradation of the production quantity is required, as shown in block 460. Block 460 is described in further

detail with reference to FIG. 5, and the corresponding description beginning at page 11 and continuing to at least page 12 of the present application.

Claim 37 is directed to a computer data signal that is representative of a sequence of instructions performing a method of production management. FIG. 3 shows, at block 310, determining that at least one request exceeds a production capacity of a vendor. At block 320, a reduced quantity of each of the plurality of products is determined. With reference to FIG. 4, the method 400 includes determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products that determines if a requested quantity exceeds an inventory quantity. An actual time to produce all of the requested plurality of products is determined at block 440, and is compared to the target time at block 450, so that if the actual time is greater than or equal to the target time, the customer order exceeds a production capacity of the vendor, and a graceful degradation of the production quantity is required, as shown in block 460. Block 460 is described in further detail with reference to FIG. 5, and the corresponding description beginning at page 11 and continuing to at least page 12 of the present application.

Claim 39 is directed to a computer-readable medium having a stored data structure representing a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124 capable of storing the data structure. With reference to FIG. 3, at block 310, the method 300 includes determining that at least one request exceeds a production capacity of a vendor. At block 320, a reduced quantity of each of the plurality of products is determined. With reference to FIG. 6, a method 600 includes determining at block 610 a time shortfall, defined as a difference between the actual time and the target time. The time shortfall is communicated to the customer at block 620. At block 640, an inverse profit probability is calculated, that reflects the portion of the total profit that will be derived from the product. A graceful decrement is determined at block 650, which is determined from the time shortfall, based upon the time short fall, the calculated inverse profit probability, and the current number of products. An objective value is updated at block 660 (and also shown in Table 6 on page 14) and the actual quantity is determined at block 670 (and also shown in Table 7 on page 14). A actual production time is determined at block 680, which is the

summation of the objective values over the number of products (as also shown in Table 2 on page 15).

Claim 43 is also directed to a computer-readable medium having a stored data structure that is operable to implement a method according to the several embodiments. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124, having computer-executable instructions to implement the several embodiments of the invention. The method implemented by the computer readable medium is generally shown in block 320 of FIG. 3, and is shown in greater detail in FIG. 6. The method is described at page 9 and extending to at least page 15.

Claim 46 is directed to a system for transacting, in electronic commerce, a method according to the several embodiments of the invention. FIG. 1 generally provides a system that may be configured to implement the various embodiments of the invention. In particular, the system 100 shown in FIG. 1 includes a processor 118. The software means to execute the method is generally shown in FIGs. 3-6 in the present application.

Claim 47 is directed to a computerized apparatus for production management. FIG. 1 generally provides a system that is configured to implement the various embodiments. The apparatus may include a demand analyzer, which is generally shown in FIG. 7 of the present application, and described in detail in the written description starting at page 15, and extending at least to page 19. The apparatus also includes a graceful quantity degrader, which is provided in FIG. 7 at block 760.

Claim 49 is also directed to a computerized apparatus for production management. Again, FIG. 1 generally provides a system that is configured to implement the various embodiments. The apparatus includes an excess quantity determiner, which is generally shown in FIG. 8 of the present application at block 810. The excess quantity determiner is described in detail in the written description starting at page 15, and extending at least to page 19. The apparatus also includes a reduced quantity determiner at block 850, which is also described in detail in the written description starting at page 15 and extending to at least page 19.

Claim 52 is also directed to a computerized apparatus for production management. Yet again, FIG. 1 generally provides a system that is configured to implement the various

embodiments. The apparatus includes an excess quantity determiner, which is disclosed in FIG. 8, and is further described in detail in the written description starting at page 15 and extending to at least page 19. The excess quantity determiner is operable to determine one or more customer requests for a plurality of products that exceed a stated production capacity. The apparatus also includes a reduced quantity determiner that is operably coupled to the excess quantity determiner to yield a reduced quantity from a reduced quantity determiner, which further includes a gracefully decremented quantity determiner. The reduced quantity determiner and the gracefully decremented quantity determiner are also shown in FIG. 8, and described in detail at page 15 and extending to at least page 19.

Claim 54 is directed to a computer readable medium. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124, having computer-executable instructions to implement the several embodiments of the invention. The computer readable medium further includes a demand analyzer operable to determine if a vendor can satisfy a quantity of a customer demand for a product. This element is shown in FIG. 7 and described in detail in the written description at page 15 and extending to at least page 19. The computer readable medium further includes a graceful quantity determiner, which is shown in FIG. 10, and also described in detail at page 15 and extending to at least page 19.

Claim 56 is also directed to a computer readable medium. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124, having computer-executable instructions to implement the several embodiments of the invention. The computer readable medium further includes an excess quantity determiner, shown as block 810 in FIG. 8. The medium also includes a reduced quantity determiner, shown in FIG. 8 as block 850. The excess quantity determiner and the reduced quantity determiner are described in the written description at page 15 and extending to at least page 19.

Claim 59 is directed to still another computer readable medium. FIG. 1 is a block diagram of hardware and operating environment 100 that includes, *inter-alia*, a random access memory 120, a read only memory 122, and one or more mass storage devices 124, having computer-executable instructions to implement the several embodiments of the invention. The

computer readable medium also includes an excess quantity determiner and a reduced quantity determiner that further includes a gracefully decremented quantity determiner. The excess quantity determiner and the reduced quantity determiner are described in detail at page 15 and extending to at least page 19.

This summary does not provide an exhaustive or exclusive view of the present subject matter, and Appellant refers to the appended claims and its legal equivalents for a complete statement of the invention.

## **6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1-3, 11-21 and 31-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 16-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 30-32, 34-35, 37-41, 43-44, 46-49, 52-56 and 59-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,055,519 to Kennedy, *et al.*, (hereinafter “the Kennedy reference”)

Claims 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 33, 36, 42, 45, 50, 51, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference as applied to claims 13, 31, 39, 43, 49 and 56, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,615,109 to Eder (hereinafter “the Eder reference”).

## **7. ARGUMENT**

### ***A. Summary of Arguments***

Appellants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in allowable form for various reasons as detailed in the arguments below.

### ***B. Applicable Law***

#### ***1. 35 U.S.C. § 112***

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner must determine whether the disclosure, when filed, contains sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention. The Examiner has the initial burden to establish a *prima facie* case that promotes a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To overcome the *prima facie* case, the applicant must demonstrate by argument and/or evidence that the disclosure, as filed, would have enabled the claimed invention for one skilled in the art. If the specification discloses at least one method for using the claimed invention that bears a *reasonable correlation* to the entire scope of the claim, then the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is satisfied. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The specification need not disclose every detail for the specification to enable. Generalized descriptive material such as block diagrams and functional descriptions are permissible provided they represent conventional structure and may be determined without undue experimentation. A reasonable amount of experimentation is not fatal. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also *United States v. Telectronics, Inc.*, 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8 USPQ2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

#### ***2. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24

U.S.P.Q.1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Examiner can satisfy this burden by showing some objective teaching in the prior art, or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, that suggests the claimed subject matter. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Only if this initial burden is met does the burden shift to the Appellants to produce evidence or argument to rebut an assertion of obviousness. *Oetiker*, 977 F.2d at 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q. at 1444. See also *Piasecki*, 745 F.2d at 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. at 788.

When determining obviousness, “the [E]xaminer can satisfy the burden of showing obviousness of an asserted combination ‘only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references’”. *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434 (Fed. Cir. 2002), citing *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). “Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not ‘evidence.’” *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617. “Mere denials and conclusory statements, however, are not sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact.” *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d at 999, 50 USPQ2d at 1617, citing *McElmurry v. Arkansas Power & Light Co.*, 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Federal Circuit also states that, “[t]he mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.” *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 n.14, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-83 n.14 (Fed. Cir. 1992), citing *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USEQ 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In addition, the court stated in *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002), that when making an obviousness rejection based on combination, “there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by Appellants” (quoting *In re Dance*, 160 F.3d 1339, 1343, 48 USPQ2d 1635, 1637 (Fed. Cir. 1998)).

### 3. *Official Notice.*

An Examiner may rely on Official Notice of facts not in the record or to rely on common knowledge in making a claim rejection. The standard of review applied to findings of fact is the

“substantial evidence” standard under the Administrative Procedures Act. Official Notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by an examiner when the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970). If the applicant adequately traverses the examiner’s assertion of Official Notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the following action on the merits if the rejection is to be maintained. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1386, 59 USPQ2d 1693, 1697 (Fed. Cir. 2001). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention *without any reference* to the examiner’s assertion of official notice would be inadequate. “[I]n the absence of *any* demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement [Official Notice], we will not consider this contention.” *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 711, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943) (Emphasis added).

#### **4. *Claim Interpretation.***

During the patent examination process, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Terminology employed in patent claims are to be accorded their ordinary meaning, unless the text of the patent makes clear that a word was used with a special meaning. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries, Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1299, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1067 (Fed. Cir. 1999). An applicant is entitled to be his or her own lexicographer, as provided in MPEP §2111.01 (III). The applicant may define specific terms used to describe an invention, but must do so “with reasonable clarity, deliberativeness, and precision”. *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 U.S.P.Q2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir 1994).

#### **D. *Claim Rejections in the Office Action***

##### **1. *Claims 1-3, 11-21 and 31-60 are patentable***

Claims 1-3, 11-21 and 31-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully but strenuously disagrees. The Office Action indicates that the graceful decrement is “supposed to yield a

reduced number of products”, and points to page 14 of the specification as reciting an equation that yields a quantity having the dimension of time. However, reading further on page 14 of the written description, one finds that the graceful decrement is used to update an objective value ( $t_i$ ), which is further used to calculate an actual quantity ( $Q_{Ai}$ ) as indicated at lines 32-37 on page 14. Thus, the graceful decrement is properly described in the application. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection is improper.

The Office Action also attempts to redefine the inverse of the probability of profit. (Office Action, pages 3-4). The Applicant objects to the wholesale manufacture of new terminology as a part of the examination process, and respectfully submits that all of the claims recite an inverse of the probability of profit, that an example of the inverse profit probability is provided in Table 4, page 13 of the of the written description, and that the claims should be examined based on the claims and the written description, not based on any re-definitions in the Office Action.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that specific terms used in the written specification are defined “with reasonable clarity, deliberativeness, and precision”. In particular, the term “inverse of the probability of profit” is defined with the sufficient clarity, deliberativeness, and precision that is required.

**2. *Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 16-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 30-32, 34-35, 37-41, 43-44, 46-49, 52-56 and 59-60 are patentable.***

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 16-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 30-32, 34-35, 37-41, 43-44, 46-49, 52-56 and 59-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is not valid since the Kennedy reference fails to describe or suggest at least one element of the claims. In particular, the Applicant emphasizes that the Examiner admitted in the Office Action that the Kennedy reference does not disclose or suggest an inverse profit probability. Applicant further maintains that this shortcoming cannot be overcome simply by putting forth a general proposition that Kennedy inherently teaches the step of identifying the most profitable products. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for the foregoing reasons, and for the additional reasons described below

The Office Action further states that the Applicant has failed to adequately traverse the Examiner's Official Notice of various allegedly well-known matters, and consequently maintains that Applicant has waived any challenge to Official Notice. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion, and further maintains that it has not waived its right to challenge the various Official Notices claimed by the Examiner. While the MPEP purports to require that an applicant state why a subject of Official Notice is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art, such a procedure is not in accordance with established law. First, the case cited by the MPEP in support of this principle does not so state, and indeed suggests that an applicant may make a demand of the Examiner to produce authority for the contention in the Official Notice. (MPEP § 2144.03(C); *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 711, 713, 60 USPQ 239, 241 (CCPA 1943) (“[I]n the absence of **any demand by appellant** for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention.”) (*Emphasis added*). The Applicant respectfully submits that in its response to the First Office Action, it did exactly what *Chevenard* required---the Applicant requested the Examiner to provide a reference that describes the element for which the examiner is taking Official Notice. Second, to the extent that the MPEP is placing a burden on an applicant, that burden is requiring an applicant to prove a negative proposition, by “stating why the noticed fact is **not** considered to be common knowledge”. The Applicant respectfully submits that it is not possible to prove that a fact is not within the common knowledge, and further submits that it is not proper to require an applicant to do so.

**2.(i) Claims 1 and 19 are patentable.**

Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. The Examiner admits that the Kennedy reference fails to disclose “communicating the reduced quantity to a production management process”, and asserts that the step is inherently taught in Kennedy. Applicant disagrees. MPEP §2100 clearly states that: “The mere fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art *is not sufficient* to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic...” (*Emphasis added*); citing *In re Rijckaert*, 9F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957(Fed. Cir 1993). Further, “to establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is

*necessarily present* in the thing described in the reference” (Emphasis added). *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Applicant maintains that the Examiner has failed to provide a proper showing that the missing disclosure is inherently taught.

The Examiner further admits that the Kennedy reference does not teach determining the reduced quantity based upon an inverse of the probability of profit, but nevertheless concludes that the Kennedy reference implicitly teaches this by taking Official Notice of facts outside the record, which when seasonably challenged, were not substantiated. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 1 and 19 are therefore allowable. Claims depending from claims 1 and 19 are also allowable based at least upon the allowability of the base claims, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(ii) Claims 13, 31, 37 and 43 are patentable.**

Claims 13, 31, 37 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest a step of determining an inverse profit probability. The Final Office Action asserts that the step of determining an inverse profit probability is inherently taught. In support of this assertion, the Office Action states that it is inherent that “the percentage of profits from a particular product...can be determined by dividing the profit of one product into the product of all profits...” and that “...the combined percentages of profitability of all products in an order must add to 100%...”. Again, the Applicant simply disagrees. First, the Applicant does not agree that the foregoing observations characterize the various embodiments of the invention, and further, the Office Action fails to show that the missing descriptive matter is *necessarily present* in the cited reference. It is well established that inherency may not be established by possibilities, or even probabilities. Instead, “...the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the *allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art.*” (Emphasis added). *Ex Parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Br. Pat. App & Inter. 1990). Applicant therefore again maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 13, 31, 37 and 43 are therefore allowable. Claims depending from claims 13, 31, 37 and 43 are also

allowable based at least upon the allowability of the base claims, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(iii) Claim 46 is patentable.**

Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest a step of determining an inverse profit probability. The Office Action asserts that a processor may be inherently configured with software means for degrading the quantity of an order of a plurality of products using an inverse probability of profit function. The Office Action fails, however, to show how this step necessarily flows from the teachings present in the asserted reference. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Accordingly, claim 46 is allowable. Claims depending from claim 46 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claim 46, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(iv) Claims 47 and 54 are patentable.**

Claims 47 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant again respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest the use of a inverse probability of profit function, as provided in the claims. The Office Action admits that the applied reference does not disclose this, but the Examiner relies on Official Notice to provide the teaching that is missing. In particular, the Examiner concludes that it is “old and well known in the manufacturing arts, that when possible, manufacturers will identify the most profitable product in a set ...enabling them to seek ways to emphasize sales of that particular item or to substitute requested products with {similar} products with higher profit margins.”. Applicant again asserts that maintaining an assertion of Official Notice is improper, since Applicant seasonably objected to the asserted Official Notice. Further, as provided in MPEP 2144.04, “...any facts so noticed should be of notorious character and serve only to “fill in the gaps” in an insubstantial manner which might exist in the evidentiary showing made by the Examiner to support a particular ground for rejection.” (Emphasis added); citing *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 165 USPQ 418 (CCPA 1970). Applicant

therefore also respectfully asserts that the Examiner's Official Notice in this regard does not "fill in the gaps" in an "insubstantial manner", but rather is directed to particular inventive aspects of the various embodiments. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Accordingly, claims 47 and 54 are allowable. Claims depending from claims 47 and 54 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claims 47 and 54, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(v). *Claims 49 and 56 are patentable.***

Claims 49 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant again respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest the use of a inverse probability of profit function, as provided in the claims. In particular, the Examiner admits in the Office Action that the use of a inverse probability of profit function is not disclosed, but takes Official Notice that includes various assertions claiming to provide the necessary teaching. Applicant again asserts that maintaining an assertion of Official Notice is improper in the present instance, since Applicant seasonably objected to the asserted Official Notice. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 49 and 56 are therefore allowable. Claims depending from claims 49 and 56 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claims 49 and 56, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(vi). *Claim 39 is patentable.***

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant again respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest the use of a inverse probability of profit function, as provided in the claims. In particular, the Examiner admits in the Office Action that the use of a inverse probability of profit function is not disclosed, but takes Official Notice that includes various assertions claiming to provide the necessary teaching. Applicant again asserts that maintaining an assertion of Official Notice is improper in the present instance, since Applicant seasonably objected to the asserted Official Notice. This notwithstanding, the Applicant nevertheless notes that the

Examiner provides in his Official Notice, that "...manufacturers will identify the most profitable product in a set...enabling them...to *substitute requested products with {similar} products* with higher profit margins." (Emphasis added). Applicant simply cannot understand how the Examiner's foregoing observation applies to the Applicants' inventive process. Applicant makes no claim that products are substituted for other products as part of the inventive process. Applicant therefore further maintains that the Official Notice is improper, and that the subject matter of the alleged Official Notice is not pertinent in any event. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 39 is therefore allowable. Claims depending from claim 39 is also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claim 39, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**2.(vii). Claims 52 and 59 are patentable.**

Claims 52 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant again respectfully maintains that the applied reference simply fails to disclose or suggest the use of a inverse probability of profit function, as provided in the claims. As best understood, the Examiner admits in the Office Action that the use of a inverse probability of profit function is not disclosed, but takes Official Notice that again includes that "...manufacturers will identify the most profitable product in a set...enabling them...to *substitute requested products with {similar} products* with higher profit margins." (Emphasis added). Applicant again cannot understand how the Examiner's foregoing observation applies to the Applicants' inventive process. Applicant makes no claim that products are substituted for other products as part of the inventive process. Applicant therefore further maintains that the Official Notice is improper, and that the subject matter of the alleged Official Notice is not pertinent in any event. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 52 and 59 are therefore allowable. Claims depending from claims 52 and 59 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claims 52 and 59, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**3. Claims 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 33, 36, 42, 45, 50, 51, 57 and 58 are patentable.**

Claims 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 33, 36, 42, 45, 50, 51, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference as applied to claims 13, 31, 39, 43, 49 and 56, and further in view of the Eder reference.

Applicant has clearly argued above that the description in the Kennedy reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest in any motivated way, the inverse of the profitability of product. Applicant also asserts that the description in the Eder reference fails to remedy the disclosure missing from the Eder reference. Applicant further maintains that the Examiner has not properly shown that a motivation to combine the asserted references exists, by identifying at least one motivation obtained from one of the applied references. Applicant therefore maintains that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the claims 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 33, 36, 42, 45, 50, 51, 57 and 58 at least for these reasons, and for the additional reasons described below. In particular, independent claims 4 and 22 are clearly allowable. Claims depending from claims 4 and 22 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claims 4 and 22, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

**3.(i). *Claims 4 and 22 are patentable.***

Claims 4 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference, and further in view of the Eder reference. In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the Kennedy reference does not teach determining the reduced quantity based upon an inverse profit probability, but nevertheless asserts that the foregoing step is implicitly taught. In the Office Action, however, the Examiner fails to cite where the implicit teaching allegedly occurs. Moreover, in the Office Action, the Examiner takes Official Notice that “manufacturers will identify the most profitable product in a set...enabling them...to *substitute requested products with {similar} products* with higher profit margins.”. (Emphasis added). Applicant fails to understand how the Examiner’s foregoing observation applies to the Applicants’ inventive process. Applicant makes no claim that products are substituted for other products as part of the inventive process. Applicant therefore further maintains that the Official Notice is improper, and that the subject matter of the alleged Official Notice is not pertinent in any event. Applicant also asserts that the Eder reference fails to provide the teaching missing

from the Kennedy reference. Applicant therefore maintains that the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Claims 4 and 22 are therefore allowable. Claims depending from claims 4 and 22 are also allowable, based at least upon the allowable form of claims 4 and 22, and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

#### **4. Applicant's Reply to Office Action's Response to Arguments**

The Office Action put forth some contentions in response to the arguments of the Applicant in the Applicant's first Appeal Brief of September 5, 2006. The Applicant hereby replies to those contentions.

In the Office Action, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's assertion that the rejection of claims 1-3, 11-21, and 31-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 is improper. As pointed out in detail above in section D.1, the Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner errs by failing to consider all relevant portions of the specification. Specifically, by considering the entirety of page 14 of the specification, it can be seen that the graceful decrement is used to update an objective value ( $t_i$ ), which is further used to calculate an actual quantity ( $Q_{Ai}$ ) as indicated at lines 32-37 on page 14. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's consideration of only a portion of the specification is improper, and that the rejection of the claims based on that limited reading of the specification is improper.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's contention that the Examiner has improperly attempted to redefine the claim term inverse of the probability of profit as a probability of non-profitability. The Examiner then goes into a short mathematical analysis, and concludes that the "inverse profit probability" is a percentage of profit of each product within a plurality of products. As outlined in detail above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the "inverse profit probability" is clearly set forth in the specification, and neither of the patents cited by the Office Action discloses such an "inverse profit probability" as taught in the instant application. Consequently, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the Applicant respectfully requests the reversal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In the Office Action, the Examiner respectfully disagrees that he has admitted that Kennedy does not disclose or suggest an inverse profit probability. However, in the Office

Action, in no less than seven separate places, the Office Action states that Kennedy does not teach an inverse profit probability. In response to the Applicant's arguments, the Office Action goes on to state that Kennedy teaches an equivalent function of the claimed "inverse profit probability." The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Simply put, the claims recite an "inverse profit probability," that inverse profit probability is disclosed in the specification, and the Office Action fails to point out where in the prior art the inverse profit probability of the present application is disclosed. The Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record fails to disclose an inverse profit probability, and further respectfully submits that as a result the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding the use of Official Notice in this prosecution, the Applicant reiterates two points. First, the Applicant has properly objected to the Official Notice in the Office Action per *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 711, 713, 60 USPQ 239, 241 (CCPA 1943) ("[I]n the absence of **any demand by appellant** for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention.") (*Emphasis added*). Per *Chevenard*, the Applicant requested the Examiner to provide a reference that describes the element for which the examiner is taking Official Notice. Second, the Office Action continues to require that the Applicant prove a negative (*i.e.*, explain why the noticed fact is **not** considered to be common knowledge). The Applicant respectfully submits that it is not proper to require the Applicant to do so.

In summary, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims recite a system for determining a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity in a customer order that uses an inverse of the probability of profit of the product, and that the prior art of record does not disclose the inverse of the probability of the product as disclosed in the application.

## **8. SUMMARY**

For the reasons argued above, Applicant maintains that claims 1-3, 11-21 and 31-60 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant maintains that the terminology used in the written description, including the term “inverse of the probability of profit” is defined with the sufficient clarity, deliberativeness, and precision that is required.

The Applicant further maintains that claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 16-17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 30-32, 34-35, 37-41, 43-44, 46-49, 52-56 and 59-60 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is not valid since the Kennedy reference fails to describe or suggest at least one element of the claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the missing disclosure was provided by Official Notice, inherency, and various claims that the teaching is implicitly taught in the Kennedy reference. Applicant properly responded to the Examiner’s statement of Official Notice in Applicant’s response to the non-final action, whereupon Examiner failed to provide proper showing.

The Applicant also maintains that claims 4, 9, 11, 15, 18, 22, 27, 29, 33, 36, 42, 45, 50, 51, 57 and 58 were not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kennedy reference as applied to claims 13, 31, 39, 43, 49 and 56, and further in view of the Eder reference. Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is not valid since the Kennedy reference fails to describe or suggest at least one element of the claims. The Eder reference also fails to provide the required teaching. Moreover, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the missing disclosure was provided by Official Notice, inherency, and various claims that the teaching is implicitly taught in the Kennedy reference. Applicant properly responded to the Examiner’s statement of Official Notice in Applicant’s response to the non-final action, whereupon Examiner failed to provide proper showing.

Reversal of the foregoing rejections and allowance of all pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RAVINDRA K. SHETTY et al.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402


Date February 16, 2007 By

  
David D. Zurilla


Reg. No. 36,776

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February 2007.

Name



Signature



### **CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A computerized method for production management comprising:  
determining a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity in a customer order in  
reference to the inverse of the probability of profit of the product; and  
communicating the reduced quantity to a production management process.
2. The computerized method of claim 1, wherein the determining further comprises:  
iteratively determining a graceful reduction of the requested product quantity from a time  
shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a reduced number of  
plurality of products, until the customer accepts the reduced quantity or until the  
time shortfall is non-existent.
3. The computerized method of claim 1, the method further comprising:  
determining that the requested product quantity can not be satisfied within a customer  
target time period.
4. A computerized method for production management comprising:
  - (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a  
production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products  
includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process  
and inventory operation data and from customer order data; and
  - (b) determining a quantity of each of the plurality of products corresponding to a  
vendor maximum profit of the requests for a plurality of products, from a  
degradation of the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products  
as a function of the inverse of the probability of profit from the product.
5. The computerized method of claim 4, the method further comprising:

- 
- (c) communicating the quantity of each of the plurality of products corresponding to a maximum vendor profit of the requests for a plurality of products.
6. The computerized method of claim 4, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:
- (a)(1) obtaining process and inventory operation data, the data further comprising an inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(2) obtaining customer order data; the data further comprising an identification of each of the plurality of products, a requested quantity of each of the plurality of products, and an associated target time of each of the plurality of requested products;
  - (a)(3) determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced from the requested quantity of each of the plurality of products and from the inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(4) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced; and
  - (a)(5) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.
7. The computerized method of claim 6, wherein the obtaining (a)(1) action is performed after the obtaining (a)(2) action.
8. The computerized method of claim 6, wherein the determining (a)(5) further comprises:
- (a)(5)(i) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin.
9. The computerized method of claim 6, wherein the determining (a)(5) further comprises:

- (a)(5)(i) determining a batch objective value for producing and delivering each of the plurality of products, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products;
- (a)(5)(ii) determining the total production time of the plurality of products from the batch objective value of each of the plurality of products; and
- (a)(5)(iii) comparing the target time to the total production time of the plurality of products.

10. The computerized method of claim 8, wherein the predetermined margin further comprises a predetermined absolute quantity margin.

11. The computerized method of claim 4, wherein determining (b) for each product in the order, further comprises:

- determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin;
- (b)(1) determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;
- (b)(2) communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls;
- (b)(3) receiving from the customer information representing reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products;
- (b)(4) determining a profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the customer order, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
- (b)(5) determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
- (b)(6) updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;
- (b)(7) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement, and from a unit time of manufacture; and

- 
- (b)(8) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.
12. The computerized method of claim 11, wherein determining (b)(4), further comprises:
- (b)(4)(i) dividing the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the customer order into the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order, yielding a portion of total profit attributable to the one product ; and
- (b)(4)(ii) determining a profit probability from the portion of total profit attributable to the one product subtracted from (b)(4)(i)
13. A computerized method for production management comprising:
- (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process and inventory operation data
- (b) determining an inverse profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the request, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
- (c) determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
- (d) updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;
- (e) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement ; and
- (f) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.
14. The computerized method of claim 13, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:

- 
- (a)(1) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.
15. The computerized method of claim 14, wherein the determining (a)(1) further comprises:
- (a)(1)(i) determining a batch objective value for producing and delivering each of the plurality of products, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(1)(ii) determining the total production time of the plurality of products from the batch objective value of each of the plurality of products; and
  - (a)(1)(iii) comparing the target time to the total production time of the plurality of products.
16. The computerized method of claim 14, wherein the determining (a)(1) further comprises:
- (a)(1)(i) obtaining process and inventory operation data, the data further comprising an inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(1)(ii) obtaining customer order data; the data further comprising an identification of each of the plurality of products, a requested quantity of each of the plurality of products, and an associated target time of each of the plurality of requested products;
  - (a)(1)(iii) determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced from the requested quantity of each of the plurality of products and from the inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products; and
  - (a)(1)(iv) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced.

17. The computerized method of claim 14, wherein the predetermined margin further comprises an absolute quantity margin.
18. The computerized method of claim 13, wherein the method further comprises:
  - (g) determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;
  - (h) communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls; and
  - (i) receiving from the customer information representing a reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products.
19. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions to cause a computer to perform a method for production management comprising:
  - determining a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity in a customer order in reference to the inverse of the probability of profit of the product; and
  - communicating the reduced quantity to a production management process.
20. The computer-readable medium of claim 19, wherein the determining further comprises:
  - iteratively determining a graceful reduction of the requested product quantity from a time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a reduced number of plurality of products, until the customer accepts the reduced quantity or until the time shortfall is non-existent.
21. The computer-readable medium of claim 19, the method further comprising:
  - determining that the requested product quantity can not be satisfied within a customer target time period.
22. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions to cause a computer to perform a method for production management comprising:

- 
- (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process and inventory operation data and from customer order data; and
  - (b) determining a quantity of each of the plurality of products corresponding to a vendor maximum profit of the requests for a plurality of products, from a degradation of the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products as a function of the inverse of the probability of profit from the product.
23. The computer-readable medium of claim 22, the method further comprising:
- (c) communicating the quantity of each of the plurality of products corresponding to a maximum vendor profit of the requests for a plurality of products.
24. The computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:
- (a)(1) obtaining process and inventory operation data, the data further comprising an inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(2) obtaining customer order data; the data further comprising an identification of each of the plurality of products, a requested quantity of each of the plurality of products, and an associated target time of each of the plurality of requested products;
  - (a)(3) determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced from the requested quantity of each of the plurality of products and from the inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(4) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced; and
  - (a)(5) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the

plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.

25. The computer-readable medium of claim 24, wherein the obtaining (a)(1) action is performed after the obtaining (a)(2) action.

26. The computer-readable medium of claim 24, wherein the determining (a)(5) further comprises:

(a)(5)(i) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin.

27. The computer-readable medium of claim 24, wherein the determining (a)(5) further comprises:

(a)(5)(i) determining a batch objective value for producing and delivering each of the plurality of products, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products;

(a)(5)(ii) determining the total production time of the plurality of products from the batch objective value of each of the plurality of products; and

(a)(5)(iii) comparing the target time to the total actual production time of the plurality of products.

28. The computer-readable medium of claim 24, wherein the predetermined margin further comprises a predetermined absolute quantity margin.

29. The computer-readable medium of claim 22, wherein determining (b) for each product in the order, further comprises:

(b)(1) determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;

- 
- (b)(2) communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls;
  - (b)(3) receiving from the customer information representing reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products;
  - (b)(4) determining a profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the customer order, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
  - (b)(5) determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
  - (b)(6) updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;
  - (b)(7) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement; and
  - (b)(8) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.
30. The computer-readable medium of claim 29, wherein determining (b)(4), further comprises:
- (b)(4)(i) dividing the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the customer order into the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order, yielding a portion of total profit attributable to that one product ; and
  - (b)(4)(ii) determining a profit probability from the portion of total profit attributable to the one product subtracted from (b)(4)(i)
31. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions to cause a computer to perform a method for production management comprising:
- (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process and inventory operation data

- (b) determining an inverse profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the request, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
- (c) determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
- (d) updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;
- (e) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement; and
- (f) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.

32. The computer-readable medium of claim 31, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:

- (a)(1) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.

33. The computer-readable medium of claim 32, wherein the determining (a)(1) further comprises:

- (a)(1)(i) determining a batch objective value for producing and delivering each of the plurality of products, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products;
- (a)(1)(ii) determining the total production time of the plurality of products from the batch objective value of each of the plurality of products; and
- (a)(1)(iii) comparing the target time to the total production time of the plurality of products.

- 
34. The computer-readable medium of claim 32, wherein the determining (a)(1) further comprises:
- (a)(1)(i) obtaining process and inventory operation data, the data further comprising an inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products;
  - (a)(1)(ii) obtaining customer order data; the data further comprising an identification of each of the plurality of products, a requested quantity of each of the plurality of products, and an associated target time of each of the plurality of requested products;
  - (a)(1)(iii) determining an effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced from the requested quantity of each of the plurality of products and from the inventory quantity for each of the plurality of products; and
  - (a)(1)(iv) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the effective quantity for each of the plurality of products to be produced.
35. The computer-readable medium of claim 32, wherein the predetermined margin further comprises an absolute quantity margin.
36. The computer-readable medium of claim 31, wherein the method further comprises:
- (g) determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;
  - (h) communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls; and
  - (i) receiving from the customer information representing a reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products.
37. A computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the method of:

- 
- (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process and inventory operation data;
  - (b) determining an inverse profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the request, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
  - (c) determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
  - (d) updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;
  - (e) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement, and from the unit time of manufacture; and
  - (f) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.
38. The computer data signal of claim 37, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:
- (a)(1) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.
39. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon an data structure representing a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity produced by a method comprising:
- determining that the quantity of the requested product can not be satisfied by a vendor within a customer target time period; and
  - iteratively determining a graceful reduction of the requested product quantity from a time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a reduced number of

plurality of products, until the customer accepts the reduced quantity or until the time shortfall is non-existent.

40. The computer-readable medium of claim 39, produced by the method further comprising:  
communicating the reduced quantity to a vendor production process.
41. The computer-readable medium of claim 39, wherein the determining further comprises:  
determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of the vendor beyond a predetermined margin.
42. The computer-readable medium of claim 39, wherein the determining further comprises:  
determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;  
communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls;  
receiving from the customer information representing reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products;  
determining an inverse profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the customer order, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;  
determining a graceful decrement from the time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;  
updating the objective value from the graceful decrement;  
determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the graceful decrement, and from the unit time of manufacture; and  
determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.
43. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon an data structure representing a reduced quantity of a requested product quantity produced by a method comprising:

- (a) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor, wherein the request for a plurality of products includes a quantity associated with each of the plurality of products from process and inventory operation data
- (b) determining an inverse profit probability from the profit of a production of one of the plurality of products in the request, and from the profit of all of the plurality of products in the customer order;
- (c) determining a reduced quantity from the time shortfall, from the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
- (d) updating the objective value from the reduced quantity;
- (e) determining the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products, from the reduced quantity, and from the unit time of manufacture; and
- (f) determining an actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, from the actual quantity to be produced for each of the plurality of products.

44. The computer-readable medium of claim 43, wherein the determining (a) further comprises:

- (a)(1) determining that at least one request for a plurality of products exceeds a production capacity of a vendor beyond a predetermined margin, from the effective quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, from the requested quantity of the at least one of the plurality of products, and from the target time of the at least one of the plurality of products.

45. The computer-readable medium of claim 43, wherein the method further comprises:

- (g) determining a time shortfall in the production of each of the plurality of products from actual time to produce all of the plurality of products to be produced, and from the target time;
- (h) communicating to the customer each of the time shortfalls; and

- 
- (i) receiving from the customer information representing reduction in the quantity associated with at least one of the plurality of products.
46. A system for transacting in electronic commerce comprising:  
a processor; and  
software means operative on the processor for degrading the quantity of an order of a plurality of products using an inverse probability of profit function in reference to profits from each of the products in the order.
47. A computerized apparatus for production management comprising:  
a demand analyzer, that determines if a vendor can satisfy a quantity of customer demand for a product, from a database of process and inventory operation data and from a database of customer order data; and  
a graceful quantity degrader, operably coupled to the demand analyzer, that yields a degraded quantity from the quantity of customer demand using an inverse probability of profit function.
48. The computerized apparatus of claim 47, wherein the graceful quantity degrader yields the degraded quantity for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity thereof, from a time shortfall, the inverse probability of profit, and from a decremented number of plurality of products of the customer order.
49. A computerized apparatus for production management comprising:  
an excess quantity determiner, that determines that one or more customer requests for a plurality of products, exceed a production capacity of the vendor within a prescribed time period; and  
a reduced quantity determiner, operably coupled to the excess quantity determiner, that yields a reduced quantity, from an inverse probability of profit of the reduced quantity.

50. The computerized apparatus of claim 49, wherein the excess quantity determiner further comprises:

- a determiner of batch objective values, from an effective quantity of at least one product identified in the request, and from the corresponding production speed of each of a plurality of product batches in the request;
- a determiner of actual total production time of the at least one products in the request, from the sum of the batch objective values; and
- a determiner of a production time shortfall, from the actual total production time, and a target production time, wherein the production shortfall indicates an excess quantity.

51. The computerized apparatus of claim 49, wherein the reduced quantity determiner further comprises:

- an inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the inverse profit probability is determined from a projected profit of a product in a customer order, and from the profit of the entire customer order;
- a gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, operably coupled to the inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the gracefully-decremented quantity is determined for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity, and determined from a time shortfall, the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;
- an objective-value determiner, operably coupled to the gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, wherein the objective-value is determined for each product in the customer order from the gracefully-decremented quantity, and from the previous objective value;
- an actual-quantity determiner, operably coupled to the objective-value determiner, wherein the actual-quantity is determined from the objective-value, a production speed of the product, and from the inventory quantity of the product; and

- a total-production-time determiner, operably coupled to the actual-quantity determiner, wherein the total-production-time is determined as the sum of objective value of each product.
52. A computerized apparatus for production management comprising:
- an excess quantity determiner, that determines that one or more customer requests for a plurality of products exceed a production capacity of the vendor within a prescribed time period;
- a reduced quantity determiner, operably coupled to the excess quantity determiner, that yields a reduced quantity, from an inverse probability of profit of the reduced quantity, wherein the reduced quantity determiner further comprises:
- a gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, yielding a reduced quantity, operably coupled to the inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the gracefully-decremented quantity is determined for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity, and determined from a time shortfall, the inverse probability of profit, and from a decremented number of plurality of products.
53. The computerized apparatus of claim 52, wherein the inverse profit probability is determined from a projected profit of a product in the customer request, and from the profit of the entire customer request.
54. A computer-readable medium comprising:
- a demand analyzer, that determines if a vendor can satisfy a quantity of customer demand for a product, from a database of process and inventory operation data and from a database of customer order data; and
- a graceful quantity degrader, operably coupled to the demand analyzer, that yields a degraded quantity from the quantity of customer demand using an inverse probability of profit function

55. The computer-readable medium of claim 54, wherein the graceful quantity degrader yields the degraded quantity for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity thereof, from a time shortfall, the inverse probability of profit, and from a decremented number of plurality of products of the customer order.

56. A computer-readable medium comprising:  
an excess quantity determiner, that determines that one or more customer requests for a plurality of products, exceed a production capacity of the vendor within a prescribed time period; and  
a reduced quantity determiner, operably coupled to the excess quantity determiner, that yields a reduced quantity, from an inverse probability of profit of the reduced quantity.

57. The computer-readable medium of claim 56, wherein the excess quantity determiner further comprises:  
a determiner of batch objective values, from an effective quantity of at least one product identified in the request, and from the corresponding production speed of each of a plurality of product batches in the request;  
a determiner of actual total production time of the at least one products in the request, from the sum of the batch objective values; and  
a determiner of a production time shortfall, from the actual total production time, and a target production time, wherein the production shortfall indicates an excess quantity.

58. The computer-readable medium of claim 56, wherein the reduced quantity determiner further comprises:  
an inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the inverse profit probability is determined from a projected profit of a product in a customer order, and from the profit of the entire customer order;

a gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, operably coupled to the inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the gracefully-decremented quantity is determined for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity, and determined from a time shortfall, the inverse profit probability, and from a decremented number of plurality of products;

an objective-value determiner, operably coupled to the gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, wherein the objective-value is determined for each product in the customer order from the gracefully-decremented quantity, and from the previous objective value;

an actual-quantity determiner, operably coupled to the objective-value determiner, wherein the actual-quantity is determined from the objective-value, a production speed of the product, and from the inventory quantity of the product; and

a total-production-time determiner, operably coupled to the actual-quantity determiner, wherein the total-production-time is determined as the sum of objective value of each product.

59. A computer-readable medium comprising:

an excess quantity determiner, that determines that one or more customer requests for a plurality of products exceed a production capacity of the vendor within a prescribed time period;

a reduced quantity determiner, operably coupled to the excess quantity determiner, that yields a reduced quantity, from an inverse probability of profit of the reduced quantity, wherein the reduced quantity determiner further comprises:

a gracefully-decremented quantity determiner, yielding a reduced quantity, operably coupled to the inverse profit probability determiner, wherein the gracefully-decremented quantity is determined for each of the products that the customer indicated a reduced quantity, and determined from a time shortfall, the inverse probability of profit, and from a decremented number of plurality of products.

60. The computer-readable medium of claim 59, wherein the inverse profit probability is determined from a projected profit of a product in the customer request, and from the profit of the entire customer request.

## EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.